

Appl. No. 09/846,582
Reply to Office action of June 18, 2004

REMARKS

In the June 18, 2004 Office Action, claims 1-9 were allowed, claims 10-12 were rejected, and claims 13-20 were deemed objectionable. Applicant respectfully declines to amend the claims at this time. Accordingly, all original claims remain pending in the application. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Claim 10 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. The Examiner questions the meaning of claim 10 and has asked for correction of claim 10. Applicant is hopeful that the following explanation of claim 10 will suffice in lieu of correction or amendment.

Claim 10 recites "A LCD device manufactured in accordance with the method of claim 1." Independent claim 1, which was deemed allowable by the Examiner, recites a method for manufacturing a liquid crystal display device. "LCD" is the common and accepted acronym for "liquid crystal display" and the use of "LCD" in claim 10 comports with this accepted meaning. Indeed, Applicant employs this very acronym in claim 11. For this reason, Applicant submits that claim 10 as originally written specifically sets forth the claimed subject matter and that claim 10 need not be amended. Accordingly, Applicant requests the §112 withdrawal of the rejection of claim 10.

Claims 11 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 5,745,092, issued April 28, 1998 to Ito (hereinafter "Ito") in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,414,441, issued May 9, 1995 to Memarzadeh et al. (hereinafter "Memarzadeh"). Specifically, the Examiner contends that Ito discloses all of the recited limitations except for at least one resistive component being configured to influence the voltage divider circuit when a shunt is severed. The Examiner contends that Memarzadeh discloses the limitations missing from Ito. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's characterizations of both Ito and Memarzadeh and, therefore, traverses this rejection.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation to modify a reference or to combine the teachings of multiple references. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Third, the prior art must teach or suggest all of the recited claim limitations. Of course, the teaching or

Appl. No. 09/846,582

Reply to Office action of June 18, 2004

suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, not in Applicant's disclosure. Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has not met all of the above criteria.

Ito discloses an LCD power supply circuit that includes a variable resistor 70 for adjustment of a number of source voltages (see FIG. 2 and related description). Applicant acknowledges that Ito generally discloses the use of a voltage divider circuit having a plurality of resistive elements. The Examiner alleges "at least one of the resistive components (71-75) having an initially shorted state" A detailed review of Ito, however, reveals no support for this allegation. As best understood, Ito contains no reference to an initially shorted state for any of the resistive elements contained in the voltage divider.

The Examiner correctly recognizes that Ito fails to disclose at least one resistive component configured to influence the voltage divider circuit when a shunt associated with the resistive component is severed. The Examiner's citation of Memarzadeh, however, is curious. Memarzadeh discloses a temperature compensation circuit for use with an LCD (see Memarzadeh's FIG. 3 and related description). Applicant acknowledges that the circuit includes a shunt resistor R_3 in series with another resistor R_4 . The shunt resistor is connected in parallel with a thermistor R_T , thus shunting the thermistor. As best understood, however, Memarzadeh neither discloses nor suggests the severing, removal, or disabling of the shunt resistor R_3 or any resistive element. In other words, the Examiner's reliance on Memarzadeh is misplaced because the Memarzadeh specification does not support the Examiner's characterization of Memarzadeh.

For at least the above reasons, the proposed combination of Ito and Memarzadeh does not teach or suggest all of the recited claim limitations. Furthermore, Applicant submits that the prior art contains no reasonable suggestion or motivation to combine the teachings of Ito and Memarzadeh – Ito is directed to the adjustment of manufacturing tolerances while Memarzadeh is directed to the unrelated task of active adjustment of LCD drive voltage in response to real time changes in temperature. Finally, the Examiner provided no indication of a reasonable expectation of success with respect to the proposed combination. Accordingly, claims 11 and 12 are not unpatentable over Ito in view of Memarzadeh, and Applicant requests the withdrawal of the §103 rejection of those claims.

Appl. No. 09/846,582

Reply to Office action of June 18, 2004


In conclusion, for the reasons given above, all claims now presently in the application are believed allowable and such allowance is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any questions or wish to further discuss this application, Applicants request that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney at (858) 350-4222.

If for some reason Applicants have not requested a sufficient extension and/or have not paid a sufficient fee for this response and/or for the extension necessary to prevent abandonment on this application, please consider this as a request for an extension for the required time period and/or authorization to charge Deposit Account No. 50-2091 for any fee which may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

INGRASSIA FISHER & LORENZ

Dated: September 8, 2004

By: 
Mark M. Takahashi
Reg. No. 38,631
(858) 350-4222